



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRESIDENT'S PANACEA.

THE main legislative issue before the country to-day is unquestionably the Tariff issue. Since the war of the Rebellion no question so momentous, or so threatening of disquiet and danger, has been appealed to the judgment of the American people.

Upon this vital and vexed issue the Chief Magistrate of the country has set forth his views. But before action is finally taken in one direction or another, it is well to pause and call a halt to consider whether these immature judgments on the Tariff do not assail the very firesides of the wage-earners and imperil the vast capital employed in the mighty industries that have taken root and attained their growth and vitality under protection.

The trouble in the conduct of such discussions as the Tariff question calls forth often lies in the absence of practical knowledge of the interests involved. This practical knowledge can come from no better source than from leading representatives of the great industries of the country. Certainly no better spokesmen would seem obtainable than the men conspicuously connected with the most important interests now threatened.

It might naturally have been supposed that such testimony would have been sought by the Ways and Means Committee at Washington. Not only, however, has such testimony been ignored, but actually rejected when offered. But an appeal lies from the majority of that committee to the people, and it now finds expression in this REVIEW, a large number of gentlemen identified with great interests affected presenting their views, in answer to the question as to what would be the effect upon their particular industries or interests of any legislative measures passed upon the lines of President Cleveland's message.

Limitations of space have forbidden any further multiplication of these views or an absolutely complete representation of the interests involved. The industries embraced, however, in this valuable collection of opinions furnish sustenance to vast multitudes of American workmen, whose homes would be threatened by any unwise revision of the Tariff, while the capital involved runs into billions.

Already the evil effects of the President's message are sadly apparent in the "Mills Bill"—a measure directed against many industries of the country, and recently described to me by a leading manufacturer, of Democratic persuasion, as "the most ingenious bill possible for shutting up all the iron furnaces of the Atlantic coast."

Indeed, we have only to look at the records of Congress to discover how many Democrats of standing, men of such genuine Democratic stamp and statesmanlike qualities as Mr. Hewitt, are committed to a policy which differs as widely as the poles from that laid down in the message of the Democratic President.

Not all the sophism in the world can veil from the American workman the inference that this message bears within it a death warrant to his creature comforts. No figures and no sophisms could reconcile him to the lot of the laborer as we may see him in the older countries, badly clad in his hovel, and living in want and ignorance. It was not for this that the emigrant came to seek a new home in a new country.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

IRON AND STEEL.

The effect of the tariff legislation recommended by the President in his recent message would be disastrous to the iron and steel industries of the country, as have been the attempts to carry out such lame theories in the past. Henry Clay said in 1832: "If I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the

establishment of their present constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824."

The tariff of 1846 drove into bankruptcy ninety per cent. of all those engaged in the manufacturing of iron in Pennsylvania. Abram S. Hewitt wrote in 1849: "Of fifteen rail mills, only two are in operation, doing partial work, and that only because their inland position secured them against foreign competition for the limited orders of neighboring railroads; and when these are executed, not a single rail mill will be at work in the land."

Employment of workmen was greatly diminished, resulting in extremely low wages for those so fortunate as to secure it. In this city of Pittsburgh, famed for the industry and frugality of its citizens, as well as the skill and genius of its mechanics, thoughtful men, with strong arms and willing hands, were reduced to idleness and want. These worthy people were compelled to accept the charities of the more fortunate, and get from the soup stations, established for the purpose, sustenance for themselves and their families, and this at a time when the products of the farm were absurdly cheap in Pennsylvania; when in the Western States corn was burned for fuel, and other grain remained in stacks from year to year unthreshed. These dire consequences were not confined to the iron interests, but affected all branches of industry alike throughout the country. The Government was brought to the verge of bankruptcy by the same cause.

The full force of the blow of the tariff for revenue only of 1846 was not felt because of the Irish famine, which created a demand for all our surplus grain; the Mexican War, which gave employment to men and circulation to money; the acquisition of California, and the discovery of precious metals; the wars and rumors of wars in Europe, which caused an abnormal demand for our products.

The tariff is simply a question of wages and rate of interest. If it were possible to make the interest rate here as low as it is in other countries for business purposes, before we shall have acquired a corresponding amount of capital; if it were wise, desirable or possible to reduce wages to the pinching standard of other countries, where every member of a family, old and young, male and female, is compelled to labor to earn a miserable living, there would be no necessity for a protective tariff, because our natural

advantages are quite equal to the best. But, if we favor "the policy which inspires labor with hope, and crowns it with dignity; which gives safety to capital, and protects its increase; which secures political power to every citizen, comfort and culture to every home," we must have protection against the products of foreign cheap labor, which will assure contentment as well as loyalty to, and veneration for, a government by the people.

In addition to the wonderful development of this great country since 1860, are not the comfortable homes of the working men, and the grand aggregate of deposits in savings banks acquired since that time, notwithstanding the intervening wasting war, indubitable testimony in behalf of a protective tariff?

Why the President associates the tariff with combinations and trusts is not clear. They are temporary expedients against fierce competition, which only serve (even when conducted within the law) to invite increased competition, and render the last state of those who join them worse than the first. George Stephenson said that "where combination is possible, competition is impossible." In this land of liberty, the proposition must be reversed. Where competition is possible, combination is impossible.

Mr. Cleveland's logic in endeavoring to show that man's condition may be bettered by diminishing his ability to earn, is hazy, to say the least.

B. F. JONES.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

IRON ORE.

In the production of last year's grand aggregate of American iron and steel, there were used 12,500,000 tons of iron ore. Of this quantity, about 11,300,000 tons were raised from our American mines and carried by American ships and railroads to the furnace and the mill, while 1,194,301 tons were imported, mainly from Spain, Africa, Italy and Cuba, and paid a duty of seventy-five cents per ton. Every ton of these importations *displaced* a ton of American ore. About three-fifths of this foreign ore took the place, along the Atlantic seaboard, of Northern New York, Champlain, Hudson River, New Jersey, and Eastern Pennsylvania ores, and two-fifths went over the mountains to displace at Johnstown, Pittsburgh and Wheeling, an equal

quantity of Lake Superior and Missouri ores. Southern ore industries, newly born, will soon feel the same pressure, the same loss of market. Hampton Roads will be the entrepot for foreign ores into Southern ore fields.

But why not remove this small defense of American ore production, seventy-five cents per ton? A tariff framed that way would be in line with the President's ideas. There is one supreme obstacle, the question of wages—wages for hundreds of thousands of laborers. The drill and the pick below the surface only begin the process. After them come the hoisting machinery, the docks, the railroads, the shipping; vast systems of interlocked, interdependent industries. In the mining and transportation to the mills and furnaces that consume it, of Lake Superior ore alone, \$150,000,000 of capital is invested. There it is planted, and with all its enormous labor occupation. It takes the risk with its dependent labor, of waste and final destruction when mines become exhausted, or when its market, as in case of displacement by foreign ores, is destroyed. It must be remembered, too, that against the 40 miles of average distance that ores, fuel, and limestone, are carried to the furnace in Great Britain, are 400 miles in the United States.

Mr. Jeremiah Head, well known in the United States and in Europe, recently read a paper before the Mechanical Science Section of the British Association on the iron mines of Bilbao, Spain. He gave the following comparative statements:

The hours of labor *per week* were: At Bilbao, 72; in Cleveland District, England, 46; on Lake Superior, 55 to 60. Wages *per day* for drillers and miners at Bilbao, 60 to 72 cents; Cleveland, drillers and miners, \$1.21; Lake Superior, drillers and miners, \$2.25 to \$2.75. Wages per day for common laborers at Bilbao, 36 to 60 cents; Cleveland, common laborers, 72 to 84 cents; Lake Superior, \$1.60 to \$2. Wages per day for boys or women, Bilbao, 24 to 36 cents; Cleveland, boys or women, 24 to 60 cents; Lake Superior, \$1 to \$1.25. Wages of miners, then, on Lake Superior are more than three and three-quarter times what they are at Bilbao, and more than double those paid in the Cleveland District. The labor cost to a ton of ore on Lake Superior would be ten times what it is at Bilbao, and more than four times what it is at Cleveland. The average metallic content of Lake Superior ore is a little more than Bilbao, but the labor cost of a ton of iron ore in

the Lake Superior region would be at least eight or nine times that at Bilbao. Under these labor conditions and the present rate of duty, importations are likely to continue to increase. In that event wages in American ore production must decline, or a large number of American mines will be closed and the men pushed out to crowd laborers in other industries. This process began three years ago in New Jersey. Prof. George H. Cook, in his annual report for 1884, said: "The low price of iron ore and the light demand for ore at almost any figure have caused a large shrinkage in the production and closed many of our mines. The large and increasing importations of iron ore from Spain and Africa also operate against our mines." And yet the Revenue Reformer wants "free ore."

The *consumers* of ore, however, look further ahead. They said—the iron and steel manufacturers of the United States, assembled in convention at Cresson, Pa., September, 1882—by unanimous vote, that the duty on ore ought to be eighty-five cents per ton.

The Eastern Pig Iron Association, in whose district all the importations of ore are landed, in its official reply to the circular of tariff inquiry sent out by Secretary Manning, in November, 1885, vigorously opposed the lowering of the duty on ore. The retention of at least the present rate was strenuously urged in the interest of the safety and the permanent prosperity of the iron and steel manufactures of the United States. The full equalization of the labor cost, between foreign and domestic ores, would, of course, require a much higher duty than the present rate.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie, the largest buyer and consumer of iron ore in the United States, and who knows very well that the reliance of the American consumer for cheap manufactures of iron and steel must be upon American ore, very sharply puts the case in these words: "Spanish labor in the mines fifty cents per day, and labor in the mines of Lake Superior two dollars per day, with cost of transport less from Spain to seaboard furnaces than from Lake Superior to furnaces in Ohio and Pennsylvania, settled the question of free ore, as it will settle the question of free coal."

The iron ore of commerce is distinctively a product of enormous combinations of capital and labor. Its designation by theorists as "raw material" does not change its relations to the expended capital and labor, nor can such arbitrary and purely constructive

classification, to suit certain theories, impair its right to full protection.

GEORGE H. ELY.

CLEVELAND, O.

IRON AND STEEL.

WAGES, PRICES, AND PROFITS.

The passage of a measure by Congress reducing tariff duties on iron and steel on the lines of the President's message would result only in mischief and disaster. It would, to use the President's terms as applied to the tariff, be vicious, iniquitous and illogical. Vicious, because the industries would be badly disarranged and business unsettled and made precarious; iniquitous, because the wages of labor must necessarily be reduced; and illogical, because the evil sought to be rectified would simply be aggravated.

The President in his message speaks of the "immense profits" of manufacturers, from which we may infer that a reduction of tariff duties would reduce these profits to a normal level without interfering with the rates of wages now paid to labor.

The "immense profits" of the iron and steel manufacturers, we regret in some sense to say, exist only in the imagination of the President. The wages of iron and steel workers, that is, the labor engaged in our rolling mills, are regulated by "Scales of Prices," which are agreements entered into by employers and employés, basing wages on the selling price of iron and steel.

This system has been in existence for over twenty-five years, and by its operation the workingmen have obtained a very accurate knowledge of the cost of production of all grades, sizes and shapes of iron and steel, thus enabling them to receive such proportionate wages as to leave to the employer but a fair and reasonable margin for profit. The manufacturer must make a profit, and it being questionable whether American manufacturers make larger profits than English manufacturers—*i. e.*, a larger percentage on the invested capital—it follows that a tariff reduction on foreign products would quicken competition from abroad, reduce prices, and necessarily lower wages and cheapen materials; hence, it is very clear that the chief sufferers would be the workingmen.

The wages now paid English iron and steel workers are miserably low, while ours are receiving reasonable and fair wages.

Space will not admit of a list of comparative wages here. Common day labor is now getting in England from 48 cents to 72 cents per day; in this country from \$1.25 to \$1.75 per day. Skilled labor shows a greater difference still in favor of the American laborer. Puddlers are paid \$5.50 per ton in this country; in England only \$1.56 per ton. Heaters and rollers will earn from two to three times as much per day in this country as the same class of workmen in England, yet our workmen receive only fair wages.

The difference in the selling price of iron and steel in each country do not show in the same ratio. The price of a ton of good fibrous bar iron in this country is about \$41.44: the same quality in England would be \$31.50, a difference of only \$9.94. The total wages paid in England in converting pig iron into bar iron is about \$4.96, and in this country about \$12.74 per ton. A significant fact is brought out if we add these wages to the price of pig iron in each country,—thus, in England, price of pig iron \$11 per ton, wages as above \$4.96—total, \$15.96; price of bar iron \$31.50; margin left for materials, wear and tear, insurance, taxes, profit, etc., \$15.54. In this country, price of pig iron, \$18 per ton; wages as above, \$12.74, total, \$30.74; price of bar iron, \$41.44; margin for materials, etc., \$10.70. Were it not for the higher governmental taxation in England, 23 per cent. against 5 per cent. in this country, the English manufacturer would be in a far better position than the American.

That we cannot stand a reduction of the tariff is very clear from the increased importations of last year. The least stiffening in prices, and we are on the danger line, and in comes the foreign product.

To reduce duties can therefore only result in larger importations; but to protect American industries we require such a revision of the tariff as to make it protective in all its parts.

JOHN JARRETT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

The President's message is a radical plea for free trade. It has taken legislative shape in the "Dark Lantern Bill" recently introduced by Mr. Mills. This bill is sectional and partisan. If it

becomes a law it will cripple many of the great industries of the country,—industries so interwoven that it is impossible to strike down one without injuring the others.

Free trade would be specially hurtful to our metal industries and to all their allied interests. The prosperity of the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery depends directly upon the prosperity of the farmer. Whatever reduces his income limits our production. Free trade injures him, and, therefore, injures us. Protection benefits him, and, therefore, benefits us. It is claimed that under free trade the farmer can buy his agricultural implements, farm machinery, clothing, and other necessities at greatly reduced prices. But he must not forget that free trade is sweeping in its effects, and, while it may cheapen his supplies, it will cheapen in still greater measure the value of his farm and all its products. The farmer now has protection of twenty cents per bushel on wheat; ten cents per bushel on rye, corn, oats, and barley; and corresponding protection on other farm products. Free trade will bring to our seaboard foreign wheat at lower prices, and at less cost for transportation than his grain can be brought from the great Northwest. He must then contend against wheat from India and Russia raised by labor at from five to fifteen cents a day. Foreign grain and foreign products will fix the price of his grain and his products. Protection means to the farmer higher prices, better crops, more valuable lands, and greater prosperity. It means, too, better markets. His home market is his best market. Now protection fosters manufacturing industries, increases the numbers employed in these industries, and decreases the numbers engaged in agriculture, and thus furnishes the farmer a larger market, with better purchasing capacity. The farmer in the States blest with manufacturing establishments more readily appreciates these benefits than the farmer of the great West, who suffers under the disadvantages of distance from his market.

What would be the effect of free trade upon the wages of the workmen? They now receive from forty to sixty per cent. higher wages than the men of like occupation abroad. They would be the greatest sufferers were free trade inflicted upon our country. Their wages would be placed on a level with the pauper wages of Europe with which they must compete.

They would barely be able to maintain themselves and their

families. How then could they purchase and own their own homes as so many of them now do ?

Workingmen should be the staunchest supporters of protection. While free trade would bring free wool and cheap clothing, it would lower wages fifty per cent. and raise the price of mutton forty per cent. ; and the old story of free trade countries would be repeated in our land—"meat for the workingman once a week."

The capital and the competition within our own country will regulate the prices of every commodity.

Our government was created to bring the greatest good to the greatest number—the working classes. The second law placed upon its statute-book was for protection. Patrick Henry wisely suggested that a good way to judge the future was by the past. Our country has always prospered under the laws of protection. Her greatest statesmen of both political parties in the past (as well as the present) have been on the side of protection : and while our present tariff laws might with safety be readjusted upon some minor points, yet the policy of free trade is founded upon false theories.

The President allows the "surplus" to accumulate—when under existing laws it should have been applied toward paying the national debt—and then points to this "surplus" as an excuse for his free-trade message.

A. L. CONGER.

AKRON, O.

TEXTILE MACHINERY.

The probable effect of any measures passed pursuant to the line of President Cleveland's message on the industry I represent, which is the building of machinery for use in manufacturing cotton, wool and worsted yarns and cloths, would be paralysis and ultimately death.

The question is so serious that to answer it in a manner commensurate with its importance, involves determining the logical interpretation of the message, so far as it relates to the industries of this country ; for, strange as it may seem, there are those who maintain that the message does not favor the policy of free-trade. Those who hold this opinion are not found only among the

adherents of the party with which the President is identified. All dispassionate thinkers, however, and the great majority of all political parties in the United States, the free-traders of England and the intelligent readers of all interested nations, agree that the message is a bold, candid and distinct free-trade paper.

Therefore, legislation on the line of Mr. Cleveland's message means the removal of the protective feature of our tariff laws, the enlargement of the free-list and the final opening of the markets of the United States to foreign competition.

It can be clearly shown that, in all protected industries where labor is the chief element of cost, the entire duty paid by the importer of the foreign article goes to the American work-people and not to the proprietors and capitalists. The effect, therefore, on the wages of workmen would be at first to reduce the amount. But, as it would be an undoubted impossibility to re-adjust at once all values upon the basis of foreign labor, the secondary result would be to deprive the wage-earner of employment in the industry under consideration.

If the duty of forty-five per cent. that nominally protects the American machine builder were removed, the machine user would be enabled to purchase mill-outfits at so large a reduction as utterly to defeat American competition. The hopelessness of the machine builder's condition would compel the discharge of his workmen and the closing of his works. But, with the ability to buy mill machinery at a price as much less as foreign is less than American labor, would come cheap goods, so cheap, that he must be a bold man who would undertake to make them in competition with English and German operatives.

Mills would stand idle, and those who now attend the spinning machine and the loom, as well as those who toil to build these useful machines, would be forced to seek other modes of gaining a livelihood, or, in default, to suffer in idleness. This is, without doubt, a gloomy picture, but, even without any legislation, the effect of the message has been to unsettle trade, reduce its volume and depress prices.

The work of man's hands, measured by the medium of exchange, fixes the measure of wealth. Consequently, such a reduction of duties as would reduce the exchangeable value of labor to the standard of any foreign people must cause widespread disaster.

Perhaps, after the slow process of re-adjustment, new values would be established and, under new conditions, with a well-defined population of laborers and artisans, there might be a revival of industrial employments ; but, of course, upon a basis of wages as low as paid in any competing country.

STOCKTON BATES.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa. _____

WOOL GROWING.

I am asked what would be the probable effect of any measures based on the lines of President Cleveland's message on the industry of sheep husbandry and wool-growing, and on the workmen's wages.

Very disastrous, I think. The slight reduction of duties on wool by the Act of 1883 has caused the slaughter of many sheep, and largely increased the importation of foreign wool. No one can have a reasonable doubt that the free admission of wool from countries so highly favored for its production, as regards soil and climate, as Australia and South America would destroy wool-growing in the United States, and inflict a terrible blow on woollen manufacturers as well.

The wages of workmen in every other industry would decline by reason of the increased competition resulting from a million or more flockmasters seeking other employments.

True, clothing and woollens would for a time at least be cheaper in price, but would they cost us less ? Here is the delusion. The laborer, the merchant, the mechanic, the lawyer, doctor, preacher, buys his clothing by the labor or service that he sells.

Destroy one great industry and its workers distribute themselves among the several trades and professions remaining. Competition lowers prices. We may have less to pay for our clothing, but less to give in exchange for it, hence it will cost us more.

Nor would free wool give our manufacturers control of foreign markets. Free cotton has not. We consume at home say ninety-five per cent. of cotton manufactures and export five per cent. The cost of labor is the principal factor in the cost of production. To compete in foreign markets we must reduce wages, transportation, interest, etc., to foreign schedules. This we cannot, will not, should not do.

The problem to solve in economic legislation is not how to cheapen prices, but rather how to diversify, encourage and protect industrial occupations for our teeming population. Prices will take care of themselves in a country so large and with such varied climate and marvelous resources as ours. Consumers have abundant protection by reason of home competition. Monopoly cannot possibly exist beyond a brief period.

But the destruction of sheep husbandry and wool growing imperils the whole protective system, and should meet the united protest of all other industries. It is the chief protected industry of the farmer, common to every State and Territory. Agricultural constituencies are, or may be, supreme in legislation. Outside a few cities farmers constitute political majorities. They have a clear right to be heard.

Domestic sheep husbandry has incidental public advantages. It makes us independent of foreign nations for our supply of clothing, all-important in time of war, as we do not command the sea. It enriches our soil. It affords the readiest means of supplying a growing deficiency in animal food. Meat is the chief item of necessary expense in a large proportion of families.

The diminished cost of animal food by the protection of sheep husbandry, with adequate import duties on wool, would many times compensate for increased cost of woollen fabrics.

W. S. SHALLENBERGER.

ROCHESTER, Pa.

COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The people of the United States were surprised and startled at the dogmatic assertions in the President's message. Had he been better informed as to the probable effect of the measures proposed, he might have been more cautious.

His party having a clear majority in the House—the opposite majority in the Senate being very narrow—with the open threats made by the Free Trade Press to coerce those Democrats who differed from the President, are sufficient cause for solicitude on the part of manufacturers.

Never before in the history of the Government has a President in his message gone out of his way to attack and impugn a purely

business class of the people, comprising men of both parties, pursuing in a legitimate way honorable callings which it has up to this time been the general policy of the Government to encourage and upbuild. This, with the Speaker's manifesto, and the extraordinary composition of the Committee of Ways and Means, are a sufficient notice to the industries of the country that they are to be put upon their defense.

What will be the effect upon the cotton industries of the country if the President and the majority of his party in Congress succeed in carrying out their policy?

The demand for home consumption of the cheaper and coarser grades of cottons was long ago fully met by the American manufacturer, and so close and sharp is the competition, that none but the very best mills under the ablest management have been able to work at a profit, some both North and South having gone into bankruptcy.

Although labor is not so large an element of cost in these as in the finer goods, the higher wages in this country have prevented our spinners from taking any large share of the trade in China and the East. There is then no outlet at home or abroad for an increased production of coarse fabrics. In the medium grades the same conditions exist. We cannot compete in the foreign market, and our own is fully supplied. The American consumer is cheaply supplied with every grade of cotton goods.

About one-fifth of the spindles of the country are making the finer grades of goods against which the foreigner maintains a sharp and quite successful competition in our own market.

There were imported into this country last year \$29,150,058.83 worth of cotton manufactures, almost entirely the finer grades of fabrics and yarns. Any material reduction in the duties upon these goods would enable the foreigner to drive the domestic manufacturer out of the market unless he could find some means of cheapening the cost of the goods. The President's "free raw material" cannot help, because cotton bears no duty. The plant is fixed. Taxes and interest cannot be reduced. If these fine mills should be turned upon the coarser fabrics the market would be glutted, and all would go to ruin together. There would be but two methods of meeting the emergency—to stop a part of the machinery or reduce the wages of labor until the cost of the goods was at an equilibrium with those imported.

This is a very simple statement, and to those unfamiliar with such matters it might appear very easy of accomplishment. But in these industrial contests none of the forces retire from the field until they are vanquished. That means a financial crippling and final stoppage of many establishments, operatives thrown out of employment, failure of traders who supply the work people, and of merchants and bankers who deal with the manufacturers. The operatives would not submit to a reduction of their pay without a contest ; but in the end the inevitable result would be that labor must take its share of the reduction. Labor in cotton factories in America is about sixty-five per cent. higher than in Great Britain, twice as much as in France, two and a quarter times that in Switzerland and nearly three times what it is in Italy. The three former send us large quantities of fine cottons, and a very small reduction of duties would enable them to increase the quantity thrown upon our market largely, stopping our mills, throwing labor out of employment, with resultant injury that would not stop with those directly interested.

All kinds of business in a country are interdependent, and any material injury to one must sooner or later be felt by all, just as when you drop a pebble into the pond curling ripples reach the shore on every side and every drop of water becomes disturbed. The cotton spinners of America have fulfilled the predictions of the fathers of the Protective system. They furnish wares unexcelled in quality at prices at which the consumer cannot and does not complain. There are no trusts in the cotton business. This attempt to disturb and injure industries which have grown up under the system of Protection is a wanton attack upon labor and upon praiseworthy business enterprises which finds no justification in the condition of the country.

JONATHAN CHACE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE MANUFACTURES.

The cultivation and preparation of flax, hemp and jute, and the manufacture of these fibres into yarns, twines, threads and woven fabrics, necessitates a large expenditure of skilled labor.

The wages paid in other countries where flax, hemp, and jute goods are manufactured, are upon a very low scale as compared with the wages paid in our mills for the same kind of work.

There can be no reasonable doubt concerning the real meaning of President Cleveland's recent message to Congress. It has received the condemnation of no free foreign trader either in Europe or America. It has met with the approval of no real protectionist. It is, therefore, in fact a revenue reform or a free foreign trade message. Its recommendations and its logic, if carried into practical operation, would produce a complete revolution in the linen industry of the United States.

As will be seen from the following facts and figures, a tariff for revenue only will as effectually destroy the American linen industry as would absolute free foreign trade. For several years the cultivation of flax and hemp in the United States has steadily decreased, and the placing of these so-called raw materials on the free list will only hasten the time when the cultivation of these fibres will be numbered with the lost arts of our American industry.

In the manufacture of these fibres the real work is done by machinery, and Great Britain makes this machinery for all the world. The same spindle is capable of running as many revolutions per minute and turning off as much yarn per day in India, Russia or Germany as in the United States. A mere glance at the wages paid in different parts of the world will convince the most skeptical that our wages must go down if the tax upon foreign goods is reduced. Without this unhappy result the American mills cannot be operated in competition with foreign mills.

It must be remembered that ocean freights are no barrier to the foreign mills, since the raw material has to be brought over the same ocean route. The unavoidable shrinkage of the raw material in the process of manufacture is, in fact, a large item of protection to the foreign mill, freight upon the dead waste being avoided. From this ugly item the American mill can find no escape.

The following were the average weekly wages paid in the flax, hemp and jute spinning trade in different countries in 1886, as compiled by the Flax and Hemp Spinners' and Growers' Association of America, from the most reliable sources of information :

	Spinners.	Carders.
United States (60 hours per week)	\$7.00	\$6.00
Great Britain (56 hours per week).	2.82	2.19
France (72 hours per week)	2.02	2.20
Germany (72 hours per week)	1.98	1.65
Eastern Russia (81 hours per week)	1.10
Western Russia (72 hours per week)	1.12	1.12
India62	.60

It is impossible to reduce the tax upon the product of foreign goods without reducing American wages. The importation of yarns under the present tariff is forcing American mills into an unprofitable existence. Only a mere pittance of the woven fabrics consumed in this country is made at home, and many of these never will be made here under President Cleveland's proposed industrial policy until American working people are content to live on rice at a cent and a half a day, and clothe themselves with only a cloth about the loins. In a large area of our country this mode of life is impossible. If by law we attempt to starve the working people into such an existence, our climate would make it impossible, and the attempt should never be made.

E. A. HARTSHORN.

TROY, N. Y.

MANUFACTURES OF SILK.

The silk industry in the United States has been built up with great difficulty. There are several distinct branches of it, one or two of which are very much older than the rest, and have made greater progress; most of them date their successes from very recent years; some are even now barely beginning, and doubtful of results. But their separate histories, so far as they go, are alike in these essential features:

(1) They begin with a long, arduous struggle:—an endeavor to compete with the European goods in possession of the market.

(2) In every instance our manufacturers have found it necessary to make better goods than those of Europe, as well as to sell at lower prices. This process has in each case to be continued until the American goods win a reputation superior to that of the European; and until, also, the popular prejudice in favor of foreign goods can be at least partially overcome.

(3) In its early stages each branch of the manufacture is an

experiment—often a very costly one, and subject to repeated failures. Both employers and employés have to learn their trade by experience, and years must be spent in training operatives and systematizing business. In most branches we are still serving our apprenticeship.

(4) Whenever any branch of the industry has achieved a measure of success against foreign competition, its attractions have caused many new concerns to start in the business, and a home competition—harder to meet than even the foreign—has been engendered, resulting in a notable lowering of prices and narrowing of margins of profit.

In all discussions of this topic, the great changes in trade which have been brought about by the steamship and telegraph must be fairly considered. Silk goods are of small bulk compared with their value; the present cost of bringing them from Europe to New York is scarcely greater than from a factory in an adjoining State; the difference in time of transit is barely a week; the order for them can be given by cable, and the settlement through banker's credits can be effected with equal ease.

The European manufacturer has cheaper capital, smaller expenses in many ways, an inherited experience, skilled operatives trained to the business, established reputation, a market in two hemispheres, and—more than all else—very low-priced labor.

To counterbalance these advantages, the American manufacturer has such protection as the tariff may afford. It is the bulwark of our industry.

What would be the effect of a material reduction of the duty on silk goods? Manifestly, a similar contraction of the industry in this country. Some hundreds of manufacturers, unable to wait until our Government could retrace its steps, would quit business except with lawyers and assignees. There would be a period of very hard times in the industry, both for employers and employed. Manufacturing here could be continued only by assimilating its conditions to those of Europe; that is, by reducing wages, so as to pay 25 or 50 cents per day to operatives who now get \$1.00 to \$1.50.

What would be gained by such reduction of duty?

Foreign manufacturers and their agents would gain the greatest advantage. The work that ceased here would be carried on in Europe.

Perhaps for a while foreign silk goods would be cheaper, though the absence of American competition would soon enable Europeans to advance their prices. This at the utmost seems rather a doubtful advantage for working-people, whose families, with reduced wages, would be less able than they are now to buy the goods.

Also, in some way that has never been clear to me, the American manufacturer who when the tariff is reduced can scarcely compete with the foreign goods in this country, will then be enabled to obtain an export trade—*i. e.*, to compete with such goods in some other country.

England has made the experiment of reducing and finally abolishing the tariff on silk goods. We do not need to repeat that blunder. The results are well known: the home manufacture fell off enormously; an increased importation of French goods took the vacant place and has kept it ever since. Poverty descended on the chief sites of the industry; in Macclesfield there were for years thousands of houses untenanted, and from that “doomed town” there went forth a goodly number of emigrants who are now prosperous citizens of Paterson, N. J.

WM. C. WYCKOFF,

Secretary Silk Association of America.

NEW YORK, March 10.

WOOLENS AND WORSTEDS.

It chanced that I need only point to the actual present condition of the industry in which I am engaged to illustrate the effect of tariff reductions, based upon the lines of the President’s message. By a misapprehension of the value of the term “worsted,” the tariff of 1883 lowered the duties upon this branch of woollen manufacture below the protecting point. The results have been vast importations of foreign worsteds, a large *increase* of revenue (which will doubtless surprise Mr. Cleveland), and an almost complete paralysis of the worsted industry in this country—which will certainly please and benefit foreign manufacturers. Fully one-half of the worsted machinery of the country is now idle and the remainder is kept running unprofitably, only to furnish employment to skilled operatives, in the hope that the discrimination against this industry is accidental and temporary, rather than the evidence of a settled purpose to destroy it.

Avoiding abstract argument upon the benefits or the evils of the protective tariffs of the past twenty years, we may all admit that owing to their stimulation we have built up in this country, during that period, a vast and intricate industrial system whose foundations rest upon the protective idea, whose growth has absorbed such a proportion of the investments and the labor of the country, and has entwined itself so inextricably with its economic and social conditions that any legislation which is inimical to that system is equally so to the country at large. To lower the duties upon the products of any industry below the protecting point is to destroy that industry in this country, to make a gift of its pursuit and the benefits and employment derived therefrom to other peoples, and to increase the revenue receipts of the Government instead of diminishing them. The present condition of our worsted manufactures will sufficiently prove this. It is obvious therefore that the tariff should be kept at a point which permits the continuance of domestic manufactures. To do this ought not to be a difficult problem. Indeed the only difficulty seems to arise from a curious morbid mental attitude which the heat of argument appears to have developed in the minds of free trade advocates ; many of these seem to regard manufacturers as a class who recklessly ply their pursuits and prey upon the community, and whose testimony with regard to the effect of laws, having to do with those pursuits, if of no more value than that of a robber touching some criminal enactment.

This frame of mind is well illustrated by the action of the majority of the present Ways and Means Committee, who, while formulating a new tariff, have persistently refused to hear the testimony of manufacturers and merchants as to its effect upon the business prosperity of the country. It is as if, in devising a law to regulate the jurisdiction of a court, the testimony of legal experts were excluded on the ground that it was *ex parte* and untrustworthy.

WALTER H. McDANIELS.

LOWELL, Mass.

COAL.

I am asked: "What would be the probable effect on the industry you represent, and on your workmen's wages, of any measures passed in the line of President Cleveland's message?"

This country's coal industry, as a whole, needs no *direct* protection from foreign coal, even be that coal free-freighted, as ballast, to our shores.

In my opinion a revised tariff may safely omit any duty on coal, provided the duty on American coal exported to Canada shall soon thereafter be abolished.

In this we should gain much more than we should lose. Canada, in many places, is burning wood, which American coal would displace but for the Canadian duty on our coal. Freed from this duty, our coal will penetrate further down the River St. Lawrence, in competition with coal from Nova Scotia, than it is now able to do.

But, coal is the mainspring which drives the wheels of manufacture and of commerce. Our manufactures were built up under the shelter of a tariff, not for revenue only, but also for protection. Any unfriendly or unwise tampering with that tariff, resulting in reducing that protection below the point necessary in order that American capital and American labor may stand against competition from the starvation labor of Europe, cannot but react hurtfully on our coal industry, reducing both the wages of our workmen and the output of our coal.

Let the tariff be revised, but let it be done only by hands *known* to be friendly to protection of American industries. Common interest so demands.

The President's recent proposition touching this revision has already produced widespread distrust, and has exerted a baneful influence on our industries: not because the people are unwilling that revision be made, but because they fear that revision if made by unfriendly hands.

They are willing that all excessive protection, which results in only unusual and unfair profits to capital, and which thus unnecessarily taxes productive labor, shall be pruned away.

They want only such protection left as shall prevent our citizen workmen from being forced to the wage level of Europe.

The condition of our industries to-day renders unwise any unnecessary experiment. To illustrate, let two circles, the larger enclosing the smaller, represent the case, the larger circle representing the total number of our workmen, the smaller circle representing the number of those workmen employed, and the space between the lines of the two circles representing the unemployed.

The employed are the producers, and upon them is the whole burden of the community. The unemployed are a tax upon those producers. Anything which tends to reduce the circumference of the smaller circle will increase the space between the circles. Unwise tampering with the laws under which our industries have grown and thrived will decrease the size of the inner circle, and thus increase the burden upon the producing labor. Again, let two similar circles represent the respective ratio of total workmen and total employed workmen in Europe, changing only the relative sizes of these circles so that the space between their lines shall be much larger than that between those representing the American situation. Then unwise reductions in our tariff will extend the circle of European employed workmen just in proportion as it reduces the circle of the employed in America, thus transferring part of the burden from the employed in Europe to the employed in America, and the logical conclusion of this line of action must be either to force our wage level down to that of Europe, or to bring about a situation represented by an exchange of the circles representing the relative situation in the two countries, giving to us the two circles showing the greatest space between their lines. When these exchanged circles shall represent the then true situation of affairs, a necessity will have arisen for American statecraft, following European practice, to form a standing army, from the unemployed, taxing the disproportionate ranks of the producers for its support, as a lesser evil than to subject those producers to the viciousness consequent from the largely excessive numbers of the unemployed. Europe is in this condition to-day. Is it wisdom on our part to experiment toward that condition? Patriotism seems to demand that our citizens should cheerfully bear so light an individual tax as that resultant from our present tariff laws, when of that aggregate tax so large a portion is distributed to our citizen workmen, enabling them to rear and educate their sons to the level demanded by American citizenship, and to fit their daughters for wifehood and motherhood, instead of, as in Europe, sending them immature to do manual labor in the mines and fields.

Let us, as citizens of a great country, instinct with patriotic feelings, give competition free play among ourselves, and thus, while cheapening productive cost, retain the yearly increment of wealth, but let not our lawgivers force us into competition with

the foreign laborer within whose breast long continued want and squalor have doubtless left but little room for feelings patriotic.

WM. P. DE ARMIT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

PAPER.

It is asked how the paper industry would be affected if President Cleveland's tariff views became the policy of the Government.

The consumption of paper in this country exceeds, per capita, that of any other nation: indisputable evidence of the superior condition and general prosperity of the American people; and forcibly illustrating the effects of the present protective tariff policy of the country.

Although the average rate of duty on all manufactured goods exceeds 40 per cent., the present duty on unsized printing paper, which is much the larger part of the paper product of the country, has been reduced to 15 per cent. Several dutiable articles—caustic soda, soda ash, alum, ultramarine, aniline dyes, woolen felts, brass wire, and wood pulp—are, in a sense, the raw material for paper making. Most of these articles pay a much higher rate of duty than is levied on paper, yet, they being *distinctive manufactures*, American as well as foreign, the paper manufacturers ask no change in duties, believing that such change would check, if not annihilate, the American manufacture and consequently destroy the competition now going on between the manufactures of all countries. All these manufactures are of recent establishment in this country, and they have wrought a wonderful change in the cost of their respective productions, and could not survive free trade and maintain the present standard of wages paid by them. Further, paper makers, as a class, recognize that there is in this system a *principle* as well as a *policy*, and honor it by according to other industries that protection which they ask for themselves.

The wages paid in any branch of the paper industry in America are more than double those paid in any other country.

The price of common "newspaper" in 1860 was fully 9 cents per pound; it rose during the war to 28 cents, and is now sold at $4\frac{1}{4}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. The consumer of paper has certainly

no occasion to complain. In what other industry has there been such a marked reduction in price?

A general depression in other industries would directly and quickly affect the paper trade. The very general use of paper in newspapers and books could, and would, be curtailed by the lessening of the purchasing power of labor, or by the non-employment of men, a condition certain to follow the throwing wider open our markets to the products of other nations, wrought with cheap labor.

The cry for free trade, or the demand that all the *protective* features shall be eliminated from the tariff, is the voice of the *few*, with whom I have not time to deal in this brief article.

Laws, both human and divine, are instituted and maintained for the purpose of affording the greatest good to the greatest number. The present American tariff system, so well grounded and so thoroughly tested, and so beneficent in its results to the *many*, should not, and, I predict, will not, be overthrown, though tangled in American politics and vigorously assaulted from abroad.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

WM. A. RUSSELL.

PLATE GLASS.

Our industry, the manufacture of plate glass, is a peculiar one. The capital required is large, the process of manufacture exceptionally hazardous and the skill demanded very great. Every attempt to manufacture plate glass in America was a failure, resulting in financial disaster and ruin to the undertakers, until we took hold of it at this place. In fact every dollar (aggregating millions) invested in it before 1879 was lost.

My father was a retired banker, worth several millions. Persuaded by friends, he invested \$200,000 in this business. The company borrowed freely from his banks, until in 1872, finding \$500,000 of his money involved, he left his retirement and took personal charge of the works, putting in nearly a million dollars more.

In 1879, when the business first reached a paying basis, his actual losses were \$619,790.40. Since then we have not made up this loss, without counting interest. If the money put into this business had been invested in Government bonds, and the interest re-invested, his estate would have been half a million dollars

larger, and his life probably prolonged for years—for he died from overwork.

It is therefore patent that the profits cannot meet the reduction. If it comes, we must either stop our works or our labor must stand it. Seventy-five per cent, of the cost of production is labor. Our skilled workmen average \$17.04 per week, against \$7.05 in England, \$6.34 in France and \$6.60 in Belgium.

The only labor we have *ever* imported was skilled men, whose knowledge was necessary to start the new industry. In Europe, father, mother and children were barely able by their united earnings to keep body and soul together. Our men earn enough to support their families and educate their children.

Before we made plate glass, the foreigner, having a monopoly, charged exorbitant prices. The records of the Treasury Department show that the average cost of large unsilvered plate glass imported in 1875 (our first year of active competition) was $97\frac{9}{10}$ cents per square foot, while in 1887 the average was $32\frac{7}{10}$ cents, a reduction of $66\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Silvered plate glass averaged in 1875 \$1.26 per square foot, in 1887 it averaged \$1.09 $\frac{7}{10}$ per square foot, a reduction of $12\frac{23}{100}$ per cent. Why is the reduction in one five times larger than the other? Solely because unsilvered plate is made in America, while silvered plate is not, and higher prices are exacted and will be forever, unless the present tariff is maintained until factories can be established. A plate of glass costing \$105 when our works were established sells to-day for \$31.50, and, bear in mind that no part of this great reduction is due either to improved methods or improved machinery, but *solely* to sharp competition of American manufacturers.

Americans can do what any people can, but they cannot in fifteen years reach the same condition that France attained under an absolutely prohibitory tariff in two hundred years and England reached under a tariff eight to twelve times as large as ours in one hundred and sixty years.

I have faith to believe that, when we are old enough to have full crews of Americans, their "genius" will make improvements and discoveries that will revolutionize our business and enable us to compete on equal grounds with foreign makers and still pay living wages, but that day has not yet come.

N. T. DE PAUW.

NEW ALBANY, Ind.

SUGAR CULTURE.

The abolition of the duty on sugar would mean the entire annihilation of the Louisiana sugar industry. The sugar fields would be abandoned to weeds and willows, and the machinery of the costly factories rendered valueless, except as scrap iron. A considerable reduction of the duty, say 50 per cent., would have about the same effect as its entire repeal, although the abandonment of sugar culture would be more gradual in the former than in the latter event.

About one-half the capital and one-half the population of the State of Louisiana are employed in sugar culture. The extinction of this industry would result in the gradual forced emigration of the great majority of the laborers engaged in this branch of agriculture. Were it possible, and it is not, to substitute any other crop for that of sugar, there is no other that will support so large a population on a given area of land.

The sugar crop last year sold for more than \$20,000,000, the most of which was distributed through the channels of interstate commerce. The destruction of capital consequent upon a repeal of the sugar duties would not only involve merchants, planters, and laborers in a common ruin, but the loss of the sugar industry would be a national calamity.

If called upon to bear a share in any general sacrifice for the public welfare, the Louisiana planters might be willing, and possibly able, to stand a reduction of ten per cent., if assured of future stability.

While any reduction would have an injurious effect, the instability of the present tariff is far more serious in its consequences than would be a slight reduction of duty.

To keep up with the scientific development of the sugar industry abroad, new and expensive machinery is required by the planters; but it is considered unsafe to invest any large amounts of capital in this manner under the annual and the existing menace of unfavorable tariff legislation.

Taking bad and good years together, the sugar industry has made steady, if not rapid, progress, the crop of last year having been exceeded by only six ante-bellum crops. The product for ten years, from 1865 to 1874, was 490,000 tons; for a like period,

from 1875 to 1884, 1,030,000 tons, an increase of more than 100 per cent. Progress is now more marked than ever, and but for the agitation in Congress, the prospects of the sugar industry were never brighter.

The question of wages depends of course upon whether the industry advances or retrogrades. With adequate and stable protection the production of sugar in Louisiana will largely increase from year to year, and the consequent demand for labor will insure even better wages than are now paid. On the other hand, if the duty be so reduced as to lead to the partial abandonment of cane culture, a reduction of wages would undoubtedly follow an excessive supply of labor and lower prices for sugar.

With such wages as free American laborers command it is impossible without tariff protection to compete with the beet sugar produced under bounties by the cheap labor of Europe, and with South American, West Indian, East Indian and Hawaiian cane sugars grown by coolie or other semi-slave labor.

LOUIS BUSH.

NEW ORLEANS, La.

SOUTHERN INTERESTS.

Radical changes in our national tariff laws would affect the people of Florida less directly, but not less sensibly, than they would the people of the Northern States. Florida has few protected industries of present importance, orange-growing and lumber manufacture being chief; but she is, nevertheless, much concerned in the maintenance of Protection. We are told by Southern revenue reformers that the tariff has made the North rich and prosperous, but has not benefitted the South. What is said of the North we believe to be true; what is asserted of the South is nearly true of Florida, if we consider only the tariff's direct effects, but not otherwise. Florida, until of late, was always poor—poor under revenue tariffs and under Protection—and she might have remained forever poor except for that very prosperity at the North which, having developed the great West, turned its bounty upon us and gave to Florida, the earliest discovered and longest settled, her first start in the world. Florida's recent growth is due directly to that prosperity which Protection

has built up in the North. Eight years ago a Pennsylvania manufacturer redeemed Florida's public domain from pawn, receiving for his million thus devoted a tract of overflowed land ; with other hundreds of thousands he drained a great area of it, planted a thousand acres of sugar-cane, bought improved machinery, and is, to-day, harvesting his first crop. The district, when drained, will contain several million acres of richest sugar lands, one-half of which will belong to the State. If the sugar tariff is spared, Florida will yet produce, as prophesied by ex-President Grant, in 1880, "the one hundred million pounds of sugar now imported." The release of our public domain gave us railways—nearly fifteen hundred miles of new track since 1881 ; railways have brought immigration, developed new industries, established trade, given us splendid hotels and tens of thousands of winter tourists, all from the same prosperous North. And we have yet other undeveloped industries, one, at least, as great as all we may expect of sugar ; I refer to the possibilities of our native fibre plants. As Florida's start in life is due to Northern prosperity, so is her future dependent upon its continuance. Hard times at the North means for us scarcity of money, high rates of interest, railway and other building stopped, no market for fruits and winter vegetables, no tourists, and ten thousand tramps. We see no benefit to us in a transfer of prosperity from Northern manufacturers to Northern importers ; the manufacturer keeps the money at home where we can borrow of it ; the importer sends it abroad. We are not convinced by arguments about the tax on necessities ; where the mean temperature of winter rarely falls below fifty degrees Fahrenheit the price of woollens is not a burning issue. We are not moved by the revival-of-foreign-commerce plea. It is paying best to develop our internal resources. If our country, like the British empire, were in pieces, separated by leagues of sea, we, too, should need ships, but we are in one piece, and in railways we have outstripped all the rest of the world. While New York harbor is ready for foreign commerce, Florida harbors are not. In New York's far-seeing economy appropriations for Southern harbors have been always "swindles" and "steals," reserved for New York press denunciations and the vetoes of tariff-reducing presidents.

JOHN P. VARNUM.

JACKSONVILLE, Fla.

THE LABOR MARKET.

“What would be the effect on workmen’s wages in this country, of any measures passed in accordance with the recommendations of President Cleveland’s message, in regard to reduction of revenue by taking the amount necessary off from our present tariff?”

In answer to this question, I would say most unhesitatingly that it would do one of two things : either have the effect, in many branches of our manufactures, of forcing a reduction in the price of labor from ten to thirty per cent. ; or would force the wage earners employed in these occupations into other fields of labor not so immediately and directly affected by the operations of a protective tariff ; and as those fields of labor are now supplied to meet the demand for our present population, such transfer would not be made to any extent, and therefore it must of necessity take the course of reduction of wages in this country, approximately to the scale of wages paid the same kind of labor in Europe, and the reasons are very plain :

Steam and electricity have in the past few years changed all the currents of trade with foreign countries. Quick, certain and cheap transportation on the ocean, has so changed the conditions of trade, that the slightest vibration in prices or of the conditions of the law of supply and demand, or of the cost of product, is at once felt all over this country as well as Europe.

A difference of even 5 per cent. in the cost of production of any given article of manufacture, will either retain the orders for production in this country, or it will transfer them to European manufacturers. This being the fact (as every dealer knows) it will immediately bring the price of labor in this country in competition with the labor of Europe, and this state of things will not take, as in old times, a long time to accomplish, but will be immediate and complete, just so soon as the laws go into effect that create this state of affairs.

Then what is the inevitable result ? The labor market in this country (and I am glad that it is so) resists reduction in the price of labor—and the result must of necessity be, that the orders for many goods now manufactured in this country must and will go to foreign manufacturers ; our mills will reduce their output or stop entirely, and the raw products now manufactured in this

country will be transported in foreign ships (for we have none to speak of) and be returned to us in a manufactured state. Our labor market would be over-supplied; discontent, murmurs and suffering would ensue, *but finally the wage earner must accept a rate of wages that is nearly on the plane of the European laborer.*

This result will come not alone to operatives in our manufacturing industries, but also to the thousand and one industries wholly dependent upon increase of population and upon the rate of wages received by the mass of operatives. Therefore, the inevitable and only result that can come to the wage earners of this country, if President Cleveland's recommendations go into effect, is a reduction of wages.

NEW YORK.

H. K. THURBER.

AGRICULTURE.

The President, if I understand him, proposes to reduce the tariff on manufactured commodities, under the pretence of rendering them more cheap to the consumers. In my judgment this would be a great injury to the agricultural industry of the country. A reduction of duties must result in one of two things: in reducing the wages of our laboring people, or else transferring a large portion of the manufacturing industry of this country to Europe. Either of these would result in injury to our people generally, to none more than the farmers. The agricultural products of the country, outside of tobacco and cotton, probably amount yearly to \$3,500,000,000. Of this product about 92 per cent. is consumed by our own people, and only about eight per cent. exported. Our work people, taking one industry with another, are paid double the amount of wages that are paid to the work people of Europe for performing the same amount of labor there; and are therefore better fed, better clothed, better housed, and better educated than the work people of any country in the world; have not only the necessities, but many of the luxuries of life as well, and in consequence consume more of the manufactured commodities and eat more of the agricultural products, per capita, than any people elsewhere on the globe; for the purchasing capacity of a dollar here is as great as it is in Europe. Now, the power or ability of the workingman to buy, whether it be clothes for the body or food to eat, depends on the wages he receives. Take from him any part of the wages he now

earns, whether by a reduction or the transfer of the business to Europe, and you lessen his power to buy either agricultural products or manufactured commodities to the extent of the wages he loses, and this will affect agriculture as well as all the other industries of the country.

Anything that injures the home market injures the farmer, for the home market is his main dependence for the sale of his surplus products, and it is out of these that he lives ; it is from these that he clothes himself and family and provides the necessaries of life.

No civilized nation has ever been prosperous or great without a diversity of human industries ; and the more numerous the industries the more people will be employed and the larger the wages paid. When the people are employed they earn wages, and the more wages they earn the more goods and provisions they can buy.

There is still another phase of this question : when you transfer any of the industries to Europe, either in whole or in part, to the extent that you do it, you throw our people out of employment, and it becomes necessary for them to seek some other occupation. Many of these from necessity would be driven into agriculture, and in this way they would become producers rather than consumers of agricultural products, thereby increasing our surplus of agricultural products, and making it more difficult for the farmer to sell at remunerative prices. Therefore a reduction of the tariff as now proposed would be a source of great injury to the farmers as well as the working people of the country.

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

CAMDEN, N. J.